

**REMARKS**

Claims 7, 10, 13 and 17 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 1-6, 8-9 and 11-12 were previously cancelled.

In the Final Office Action of August 2, 2010, claims 7, 10, 13 and 17 were rejected.

With this amendment, claims 7 and 17 are amended.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 7, 10, 13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narang et al.* (US 6,168,885) in view of *Schneider et al.* (US 6,180,281) in view of *Gozdz et al.* (US 5,840,087) in view of *Kumeuchi et al.* (US 6,156,080). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 7 and 17 now recites a positive electrode having a density of  $3.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$  and a negative electrode having a density of  $1.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$ .

*Narang*, *Gozdz* and *Kumeuchi* all fail to disclose or even fairly suggest anything pertaining the density of the positive or negative electrodes, much less a positive electrode that has a density of  $3.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$  and a negative electrode that has a density of  $1.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$ .

*Schneider*, similarly, fails to disclose or even fairly suggest a positive electrode having a density of  $3.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$  and a negative electrode having a density of  $1.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$ . Instead, *Schneider* discloses a fiber matrix having a density of 15-50 grams/sq meter without disclosing anything pertaining to the density of a positive or a negative electrode. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,180,281, Col. 5, l. 40-42. This cannot be fairly viewed as disclosing the densities of a positive and a negative electrode because *Schneider* merely discloses the density of a fiber matrix that is outside the claimed range.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by providing a positive electrode with a density of  $3.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$  and a negative electrode with a density of  $1.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$ , a battery having a large discharge capacity and high energy density is realized. See, Specification, Page 21, l. 6-10.

Therefore, because *Narang*, *Schneider*, *Gozdz*, *Kumeuch* and any combination of them fail to disclose or even fairly suggest each feature of claims 7 and 17, the rejection of claims 7 and 17 cannot stand. Because claims 10 and 13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 7 and 17, they are allowable for at least the same reason.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 2, 2010

By: /David R. Metzger/  
David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SNR Denton, US LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000

12545808/V-1